

## REMARKS

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 7-8, 10-14, and 16 would be allowable if written in independent form. Claim 7 has been written in independent form so that Claim 7, and Claims 8, 11-14, and 16 dependent thereon, should be allowable. New Claim 17 is Claim 10 written in independent form so should be allowable.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Bhagat et al. Claim 1 has been amended to specify that, for purposes of Claim 1 and claims dependent thereon, the quench box has only two manways. One feature of the quench box design of the invention is that it only requires two manways, one on the collection tray and one on the final distribution tray. In contrast, Bhagat et al. require manways on the top plate 16, the lower plate 29, and the distributor plate 28. This is at least three manways. An increase in the manways increases the reactor height and the time required for reactor catalyst changeout. Thus, it is advantageous to be able to reduce the number of manways to only two. Since Bhagat et al. require at least three manways, it does not anticipate applicant's amended Claim 1 which restricts the number of manways to only two. Claim 1, and Claims 9 and 10 dependent thereon, should be allowable.

Although applicant elected the species of Claims 7-14 so that Claims 2-6 are nonelected claims, in response to the Requirement for Election, applicant amended Claims 2-6 to depend on Claim 7. Since Claims 2-6 now depend on allowable Claim 7, Claims 2-6 should also be allowable.

A check in the amount of \$100.00 to cover the fee for an additional independent claim over three is enclosed. Please charge any fees due or credit any overpayments to deposit account

no. 13-1175 of the undersigned.

Respectfully,

MALLINCKRODT & MALLINCKRODT



Robert R. Mallinckrodt  
Robert R. Mallinckrodt  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,565  
Customer No. 27469

April 4, 2005  
Salt Lake City, Utah

gen:p\009-First Amendment.wpd